*Fifteenth International Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory*
*June 18-24, 2016, Albena, Bulgaria* *pp. 151–156*

arXiv:1607.00502v1 [cs.IT] 2 Jul 2016

# Threshold Decoding for Disjunctive Group Testing [1]

A.G. D'yachkov agd-msu@yandex.ru
I.V. Vorobyev vorobyev.i.v@yandex.ru
N.A. Polyanskii nikitapolyansky@gmail.com
V.Yu. Shchukin vpike@mail.ru
Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

**Abstract.** Let $1 \le s < t$, $N \ge 1$ be integers and a complex electronic circuit of size $t$ is said to be an $s$-active, $s \ll t$, and can work as a system block if not more than $s$ elements of the circuit are defective. Otherwise, the circuit is said to be an $s$-defective and should be replaced by a similar $s$-active circuit. Suppose that there exists a possibility to run $N$ non-adaptive group tests to check the $s$-activity of the circuit. As usual, we say that a (disjunctive) group test yields the positive response if the group contains at least one defective element. Along with the conventional decoding algorithm based on disjunctive $s$-codes, we consider a threshold decision rule with the minimal possible decoding complexity, which is based on the simple comparison of a fixed threshold $T$, $1 \le T \le N-1$, with the number of positive responses $p$, $0 \le p \le N$. For the both of decoding algorithms we discuss upper bounds on the $\alpha$-level of significance of the statistical test for the null hypothesis $\{H_0$ : the circuit is $s$-active$\}$ verse the alternative hypothesis $\{H_1$ : the circuit is $s$-defective$\}$.

## 1 Statement of Problem

Let $N \ge 2$, $t \ge 2$, $s$ and $T$ be integers, where $1 \le s < t$ and $1 \le T < N$. The symbol $\triangleq$ denote the equality by definition, $|A|$ – the size of the set $A$ and $[N] \triangleq \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ – the set of integers from 1 to $N$. A binary $(N \times t)$-matrix

$$X = \|x_i(j)\|, \quad x_i(j) = 0, 1, \quad i \in [N],\ j \in [t], \tag{1}$$

with $t$ columns (*codewords*) $\boldsymbol{x}(j) \triangleq (x_1(j), x_2(j), \ldots, x_N(j)),\ j \in [t]$, and $N$ rows $\boldsymbol{x}_i \triangleq (x_i(1), x_i(2) \ldots, x_i(t)),\ i \in [N]$, is called a *binary code of length $N$ and size $t = \lfloor 2^{RN} \rfloor$*, where a fixed parameter $R > 0$ is called a *rate* of the code $X$. The number of 1's in a binary column $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \{0,1\}^N$, i.e., $|\boldsymbol{x}| \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i$, is called a *weight* of $\boldsymbol{x}$. A code $X$ is called a *constant weight binary code of weight $w$*, $1 \le w < N$, if for any $j \in [t]$, the weight $|\boldsymbol{x}(j)| = w$. The conventional symbol $\boldsymbol{u} \bigvee \boldsymbol{v}$ will be used to denote the disjunctive (Boolean)

[1]The research is supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research under Grant No. 16-01-00440.

sum of binary columns $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v} \in \{0,1\}^N$. We say that a column $\boldsymbol{u}$ *covers* a column $\boldsymbol{v}$ ($\boldsymbol{u} \succeq \boldsymbol{v}$) if $\boldsymbol{u} \bigvee \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{u}$.

### 1.1 Disjunctive and Threshold Disjunctive Codes

**Definition 1.** [1]. A code $X$ (1) is called a *disjunctive $s$-code*, $s \in [t-1]$, if the disjunctive sum of any $s$-subset of codewords of $X$ covers those and only those codewords of $X$ which are the terms of the given disjunctive sum.

Let $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{S} \subset [t]$, be an arbitrary fixed collection of defective elements of size $|\mathcal{S}|$. For a binary code $X$ and collection $\mathcal{S}$, define the binary *response vector* of length $N$, namely:

$$\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \bigvee_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{x}(j), \quad \text{if} \quad \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq (0,0,\ldots,0) \quad \text{if} \quad \mathcal{S} = \emptyset. \qquad (2)$$

In the classical problem of *non-adaptive group testing*, we describe $N$ tests as a binary $(N \times t)$-matrix $X = \|x_i(j)\|$, where a column $\boldsymbol{x}(j)$ corresponds to the $j$-th element, a row $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ corresponds to the $i$-th test and $x_i(j) \triangleq 1$ if and only if the $j$-th element is included into the $i$-th testing group. The result of each test equals 1 if at least one defective element is included into the testing group and 0 otherwise, so the column of results is exactly equal to the response vector $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S})$. Definition 1 of disjunctive $s$-code $X$ gives the important sufficient condition for the evident identification of any unknown collection of defective elements $\mathcal{S}$ if the number of defective elements $|\mathcal{S}| \leq s$. In this case, the identification of the unknown $\mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to discovery of all codewords of code $X$ covered by $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S})$, and its complexity is equal to the code size $t$. Note that this algorithm also allows us to check $s$-activity of the circuit defined in the abstract. Moreover, it is easy to prove by contradiction that every code $X$ which allows to check $s$-activity of the circuit without error is a disjunctive $s$-code.

**Definition 2.** Let $s$, $s \in [t-1]$, and $T$, $T \in [N-1]$, be arbitrary fixed integers. A disjunctive $s$-code $X$ of length $N$ and size $t$ is said to be a a disjunctive $s$-code with *threshold* $T$ (or, briefly, *$s^T$-code*) if the disjunctive sum of any $\leq s$ codewords of $X$ has weight $\leq T$ and the disjunctive sum of any $\geq s+1$ codewords of $X$ has weight $\geq T+1$.

Obviously, for any $s$ and $T$, the definition of $s^T$-code gives a sufficient condition for code $X$ applied to the group testing problem described in the abstract of our paper. In this case, only on the base of the known *number of positive responses* $|\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S})|$, we decide that the controllable circuit identified by an unknown collection $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{S} \subset [t]$, is $s$-active, i.e., the unknown size $|\mathcal{S}| \leq s$ ($s$-defective, i.e., the unknown size $|\mathcal{S}| \geq s+1$) if $|\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S})| \leq T$ ($|\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S})| \geq T+1$).

**Remark 1.** The concept of $s^T$-codes was motivated by troubleshooting in complex electronic circuits using a non-adaptive identification scheme which was considered in [2].

### 1.2 Hypothesis Test

Let a circuit of size $t$ is identified by an unknown collection $\mathcal{S}_{un}$, $\mathcal{S}_{un} \subset [t]$, of defective elements of an unknown size $|\mathcal{S}_{un}|$ and $X$ be a code (1) of size $t$ and length $N$. Introduce the null hypothesis $\{H_0 : |\mathcal{S}_{un}| \leq s\}$ (the circuit is $s$-active) verse the alternative $\{H_1 : |\mathcal{S}_{un}| \geq s+1\}$ (the circuit is $s$-defective). In this paper we focus on the testing of statistical hypotheses $H_0$ and $H_1$. The similar problem related to constructing of a confidence interval for $|\mathcal{S}_{un}|$ was considered in [3], where the authors construct the interval $[\hat{s}/c\,;\,\hat{s}]$, such that given a *random code* $X$, the statistic $\hat{s}$, i.e., a function of the random response vector $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}_{un})$, satisfies the following properties: $\Pr\{\hat{s} < |\mathcal{S}_{un}|\}$ is upper bounded by a small parameter $\epsilon \ll 1$ and the expected value of $\hat{s}/|\mathcal{S}_{un}|$ is upper bounded by a number $c > 1$.

For fixed parameters $s$, $1 \leq s < t$, and $T$, $1 \leq T < N$, consider the following *threshold decision rule* motivated by Definition 2, namely:

$$\begin{cases} \text{accept } \{H_0 : |\mathcal{S}_{un}| \leq s\} & \text{if } |\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}_{un})| \leq T, \\ \text{accept } \{H_1 : |\mathcal{S}_{un}| \geq s+1\} & \text{if } |\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}_{un})| \geq T+1. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

For the conventional *statistical* interpretation of the decision rule (3), it is reasonable to assume that the different collections of defective elements of the same size are *equiprobable*. That is why, we set that the *probability distribution* of the random collection $\mathcal{S}_{un}$, $\mathcal{S}_{un} \subset [t]$, is identified by an unknown probability vector $\boldsymbol{p} \triangleq (p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_t)$, $p_k \geq 0$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, t$, $\sum_{k=0}^{t} p_k = 1$, as follows:

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{S}_{un} = \mathcal{S}\} \triangleq \frac{p_{|\mathcal{S}|}}{\binom{t}{|\mathcal{S}|}} \quad \text{for any subset} \qquad \mathcal{S} \subseteq [t]. \tag{4}$$

Introduce a *maximal error probability* of the decision rule (3) :

$$\varepsilon_s(T, \boldsymbol{p}, X) \triangleq \max\left\{\Pr\{\text{accept } H_1 \big| H_0\}\,,\, \Pr\{\text{accept } H_0 \big| H_1\}\right\} \tag{5}$$

where the conditional probabilities in the right-hand side of (5) are identified by (3)-(4). Note that the number $\varepsilon_s(T, \boldsymbol{p}, X) = 0$ if and only if the code $X$ is an $s^T$-code. Denote by $t_s(N, T)$ the maximal size of $s^T$-codes of length $N$. For a parameter $\tau$, $0 < \tau < 1$, introduce the rate of $s^{\lfloor \tau N \rfloor}$-codes:

$$R_s(\tau) \triangleq \varliminf_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log_2 t_s(N, \lfloor \tau N \rfloor)}{N} \geq 0, \quad 0 < \tau < 1. \tag{6}$$

**Definition 3.** Let $\tau$, $0 < \tau < 1$, and a parameter $R$, $R > R_s(\tau)$, be fixed. For the maximal error probability $\varepsilon_s(T, \boldsymbol{p}, X)$, defined by (3)-(5), consider the function

$$\varepsilon_s^N(\tau, R) \triangleq \max_{\boldsymbol{p}} \left\{\min_{X} \varepsilon_s(\lfloor \tau N \rfloor, \boldsymbol{p}, X)\right\}, \quad R > R_s(\tau), \tag{7}$$

where the minimum is taken over all codes $X$ of length $N$ and size $t = \lfloor 2^{RN} \rfloor$ with parameter $R > R_s(\tau)$. The number $\varepsilon_s^N(\tau, R) > 0$ does not depend on the unknown probability vector $\boldsymbol{p}$ and can be called the *universal* error probability of the decision rule (3). The corresponding *error exponent*

$$E_s(\tau, R) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{N\to\infty}} \frac{-\log_2 \varepsilon_s^N(\tau, R)}{N}, \quad s \geq 1, \quad 0 < \tau < 1, \quad R > R_s(\tau) \qquad (8)$$

identifies the asymptotic behavior of *$\alpha$-level of significance* for the decision rule (3), i.e.,

$$\alpha \triangleq \exp_2\{-N\,[E_s(\tau, R) + o(1)]\}, \quad \text{if} \quad E_s(\tau, R) > 0, \quad N \to \infty. \qquad (9)$$

Along with (3) we introduce the *disjunctive decision rule* based on the conventional algorithm:

$$\begin{cases} \text{accept } H_0 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}_{un}) \text{ covers} \leq s \text{ codewords of } X, \\ \text{accept } H_1 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}_{un}) \text{ covers} \geq s+1 \text{ codewords of } X. \end{cases} \qquad (10)$$

For a fixed code rate $R$, $R > 0$, the error exponent for disjunctive decision rule (10) $E_s(R)$ is defined similarly to (5)-(8). The function $E_s(R)$ was firstly introduced in our paper [1], where we proved

**Theorem 1.** [1]. *The function $E_s(R) = 0$ if $R \geq 1/s$.*

## 2 Lower Bounds on Error Exponents

In this Section, we formulate and compare the random coding lower bounds for the both of error exponents $E_s(R)$ and $E_s(\tau, R)$. These bounds were proved applying the random coding method based on the ensemble of constant-weight codes. A parameter $Q$ in formulations of theorems 2-3 means the relative weight of codewords of constant-weight codes. Introduce the standard notations

$$h(Q) \triangleq -Q\log_2 Q - (1-Q)\log_2[1-Q], \quad [x]^+ \triangleq \max\{x, 0\}.$$

In [1], we established

**Theorem 2.** [1]. *The error exponent $E_s(R) \geq \underline{E}_s(R)$ where the random coding lower bound*

$$\underline{E}_s(R) \triangleq \max_{0<Q<1} \min_{Q\leq q<\min\{1, sQ\}} \left\{\mathcal{A}(s, Q, q) + [h(Q) - qh(Q/q) - R]^+\right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}(s, Q, q) \triangleq (1-q)\log_2(1-q) + q\log_2\left[\frac{Qy^s}{1-y}\right] + sQ\log_2\frac{1-y}{y} + sh(Q),$$

*and $y$ is the unique root of the equation*

$$q = Q\frac{1-y^s}{1-y}, \quad 0 < y < 1.$$

*In addition, as $s \to \infty$ and $R \le \frac{\ln 2}{s}(1+o(1))$, the lower bound $\underline{E}_s(R) > 0$.*

**Theorem 3. 1.** *The error exponent $E_s(\tau, R) \ge \underline{E}_s(\tau, R)$ where the random coding bound $\underline{E}_s(\tau, R)$ does not depend on $R > 0$ and has the form:*

$$\underline{E}_s(\tau, R) \triangleq \max_{1-(1-\tau)^{1/(s+1)} < Q < 1-(1-\tau)^{1/s}} \min\left\{\mathcal{A}'(s, Q, \tau), \mathcal{A}(s+1, Q, \tau)\right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}'(s, Q, q) \triangleq \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}(s, Q, q), & \text{if } Q \le q \le sQ, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**2.** *As $s \to \infty$ the optimal value of $\underline{E}_s(\tau, R)$ satisfies the inequality:*

$$\underline{E}_{Thr}(s) \triangleq \max_{0<\tau<1} \underline{E}_s(\tau, R) \ge \frac{\log_2 e}{4s^2}(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty.$$

It is possible to use decision rule (3) with any value of parameter $T$. The numerical values of the optimal error exponent $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{Thr}}(s)$ along with the corresponding optimal values of threshold parameter $\tau$ and the constant-weight code ensemble parameter $Q$ are presented in Table 1. Besides in Table 1 the values of $\underline{E}_s(0)$ and $R_{\mathrm{cr}} \triangleq \sup\{R : \underline{E}_s(R) > \underline{E}_{\mathrm{Thr}}(s)\}$ are shown. Theorems 1-3 show that, for large values of $R$, the threshold decision rule (3) has an advantage over the disjunctive decision rule (10) as $N \to \infty$.

Table 1: The numerical values of $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{Thr}}(s)$

| $s$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\underline{E}_{\mathrm{Thr}}(s)$ | 0.1380 | 0.0570 | 0.0311 | 0.0196 | 0.0135 | 0.0098 | 0.0075 |
| $\tau$ | 0.2065 | 0.1365 | 0.1021 | 0.0816 | 0.0679 | 0.0582 | 0.0509 |
| $Q$ | 0.1033 | 0.0455 | 0.0255 | 0.0163 | 0.0113 | 0.0083 | 0.0064 |
| $\underline{E}_s(0)$ | 0.3651 | 0.2362 | 0.1754 | 0.1397 | 0.1161 | 0.0994 | 0.0869 |
| $R_{\mathrm{cr}}$ | 0.2271 | 0.1792 | 0.1443 | 0.1201 | 0.1027 | 0.0896 | 0.0794 |

## 3 Simulation for finite code parameters

For finite $N$ and $t$, we carried out a simulation as follows. The probability distribution vector $\boldsymbol{p}$ (4) is defined by

$$p_k \triangleq \binom{t}{k} p^k (1-p)^{t-k}, \quad p \triangleq \frac{s+1/2}{t}, \quad 0 \le k \le t,$$

i.e. the number of defective elements $|\mathcal{S}_{un}|$ has the binomial distribution with the mean value $s + 1/2$. A code $X$ is generated randomly from the ensemble of constant-weight codes, i.e. for some weight parameter $w$, every codeword of $X$ is chosen independently and equiprobably from the set of all $\binom{t}{w}$ codewords. For every weight $w$ and every decision rule, we repeat generation 1000 times and choose the code with minimal error probability. Note that for disjunctive decision rule $\Pr\{\text{accept } H_0|H_1\} = 0$. In Table 2 the best values of maximal error probability for fixed parameters $s$, $t$ and $N$ are shown in bold.

Table 2: Results of simulation

| | Threshold decision rule | | | | Disjunctive decision rule | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $N$ | $\Pr\{\text{acc. } H_1\|H_0\}$ | $\Pr\{\text{acc. } H_0\|H_1\}$ | $w$ | $T$ | $\Pr\{\text{acc. } H_1\|H_0\}$ | $w$ |
| | | $s = 2, \quad t = 15$ | | | | |
| 5 | **0.1366** | 0.1355 | 2 | 3 | 0.4780 | 2 |
| 8 | 0.0732 | **0.0824** | 3 | 5 | 0.3610 | 2 |
| 10 | 0 | **0.0744** | 1 | 2 | 0.2390 | 3 |
| 12 | 0 | **0.0440** | 1 | 2 | 0.1220 | 3 |
| 14 | 0 | **0.0349** | 2 | 4 | 0.0537 | 3 |
| 15 | 0 | 0.0258 | 2 | 4 | **0.0195** | 3 |
| | | $s = 2, \quad t = 20$ | | | | |
| 5 | **0.1398** | 0.1365 | 2 | 3 | 0.5356 | 2 |
| 8 | **0.0897** | 0.0890 | 3 | 5 | 0.4169 | 2 |
| 10 | **0.0897** | 0.0858 | 3 | 5 | 0.3008 | 3 |
| 12 | **0.0580** | 0.0576 | 4 | 7 | 0.1979 | 3 |
| 15 | 0 | **0.0324** | 2 | 4 | 0.0792 | 4 |

## References

[1] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Vorobyev I.V.*, *Polyanskii N.A.*, *Shchukin V.Yu.*, Almost Disjunctive List-Decoding Codes, *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 110-131, 2015.

[2] *Zubashich V.F.*, *Lysyansky A.V.*, *Malyutov M.B.*, Blockrandomized distributed troubleshooting construction in large circuits with redundancy. *Izvestia of the USSR Acad. of Sci., Technical Cybernetics*, vol. 6, 1976.

[3] *Damaschke P.*, *Muhammad A.S.*, Competitive group testing and learning hidden vertex covers with minimum adaptivity, *Discrete Math. Algorithm. Appl.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 291-311, 2010.